- Yeah, one more time, please. Α. 1
- Why was emerging as quickly as possible a One more time. 2 goal of the company -- emerging from Chapter 11? 3
- Well first of all, as I said, our relationship with the 4 regulators was not at its zenith at the time and we felt that 5 in order to preserve the -- and enhance the estate, enhance the 6 assets, minimize the costs that are involved in a Chapter 11 7 proceeding. And to do this -- to do this on a quick basis was 8 in the best interest of the estate.
- So to kind of recap, Mr. Austin, you filed Chapter 11 now, 10 you had the efforts pre-bankruptcy to try and restructure out 11 of proceedings, you now filed Chapter and you developed a list
- of goals of trying to stabilize the business, correct? 13
- That's correct. Α. 14
- Rebuilding liquidity? Ο. 15
- That's correct. Α. 16
- Sell off the non-core business? 17
- That's correct. 18 Α.
- And focus on the core utility assets? Ο. 19
- 20 Α. That's right.
- And then to focus on converting the unsecured debt to 21
- 22 equity?

- 23 Α. That was the plan.
- And rebuild the relationship with regulators and to emerge 24
- as quickly as possible? 25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

1 A. That's right.

- 2 Q. Now, let's focus on the goal -- 'cause I think you talked
- 3 | about rebuilding liquidity. You did that with the DIP loan,
- 4 | correct?
- $_{5}$ A. We did, that was our backstop.
- $_{6} \parallel \mathsf{Q}$. And then -- just on that --
- $_7 \parallel A$. I would add that we used that DIP loan to the tune of about
- 8 | 13 or \$14 million only for letters of credit to backstop some
- g | of our vendors, but we never actually borrowed under that DIP
- $_{10}$ | facility. Basically because we focused on the cash generation
- 11 | and liquidity from the operation so we had a very successful
- 12 | processing.
 - $3 \parallel Q$. So you definitely achieved that goal?
- $_{14} \parallel A$. We did.
- 15 \parallel Q. Let's focus on the business and the stabilization. Did
- 16 | that focus on both the operation as well as the financial?
- 17 A. Yes, it did.
- 18 | Q. All right, and when you were looking at that, what was the
- 19 | focus of trying to develop both a sound business plan and a
- 20 | financial model?
- 21 A. Well, we had had a financial plan in the summer of 2003.
- 22 || What was clear is that it was not a tightly developed plan, it
- 23 | was not a bottoms-up plan. And we had to develop a plan that
- 24 | the management team, including all of the operational people
- 25 and all of the divisional people, bought into. So we spent the

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Austin - Direct

103

-- really the late summer and the fall of 2003 developing a financial plan that everyone could buy in, whether it be the -at the divisional level all the way up to the Chief Operating Officer and the CEO. So we developed a rigorous, thoughtful financial plan, which was the first one that was developed at the company. And that was what I was gonna ask you was how did you believe, based on your experience at the company, how to develop that -- we'll call it the -- let's refer to it as the 5-year business plan -- how did it compare to what had -previous plans that had been developed by the company? Well again, you had to recognize that this company had only owned -- when the first plan was developed -- the first plan that I saw, which was in the early part of 2003, that was a plan that was developed and the company had only owned Montana for a little less than a year at that point. So a lot of those plans were top-down, financial projections, and did not have

the buy-in of all the people below the financial planners, if you will. It didn't have all the operational buy-in. So, the plan that we were operating to in 2003 was one that we were clearly not achieving those plans. Some of it was due to the liquidity and the stress that was put on the company. But some

23 | if it the plan just was an overly aggressive plan. So, as we

24 headed into the bankruptcy process, we had to develop a plan

25 | that was more of a bottoms-up plan; was rigorously bought in

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

by all of the constituencies.

- $2 \parallel Q$. All right, what was your perspective, if any, of the
- $_3$ | reliability of Northwestern's forecast and projections in the
- 4 | September or October, early November timeframe?
- $5 \parallel A$. Well, they were getting better with each passing cut of the
- 6 plan. I mean, basically we developed a plan and went through a
- 7 | number of modifications. In fact, a number of the cost
- 8 | elements that were later introduced into the plan were
- 9 | recognized, if you will, during that time period. As a for
- 10 | instance, we didn't have in the original plan that was -- what
- 11 | I'll call it 2003 plan -- we didn't have an original cost in
- 12 | there for the pension expense. And as we studied the pension
- 13 | expense and the funding that the company had at that time, it
- 14 | was clear that we had that we had to put in a substantial
- 15 change into the pension expense line, which went into the G&A
- 16 | line of the forecast.
- 17 Q. Do you recall how much was added for pension obligations or
- 18 expense throughout -- say for 2005?
- 19 \parallel A. I think we added in the final analysis it was a \$19.6
- 20 million add to the pension plan at that time.
- $2^{\dagger} \parallel Q$. And just to isolate that, did that have any --
- 22 A. I'm sorry, what it was -- it was 10.6 for the 2003, but on
- 23 the go forward basis, it was closer 19 a year.
- $24 \parallel Q$. And just to isolate that one item, what impact, if any, did
- 25 that have on the company's EBITDA?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

- A. Well, it would be a direct cost to the EBITDA, so it'd take the EBITDA down by that 19.6 or in -- for 2003, took it down by the 10.6. For the 2005 and beyond, it took it down by almost
- Q. And that additional pension obligation, for example, was not embedded in the initial runs and numbers, say, in October, to your knowledge?
- 8 A. I don't know if it was in -- it certainly wasn't in the 9 middle of the summer, I don't know if was -- we captured it in October or not.
- Q. From your perspective, when was there available the first good numbers of the 5-year business plan?
 - A. The first number -- and we went through, as I said, a more rigorous and discipline process in then we presented the results of that in early December to the Board. And the Board of Directors approved that plan. We later presented that plan to the Creditors' Committee. But those were the first, what I would call, rigorously done -- professionally done, financial plans for the core business, the core business that was left behind, that the company did. Period.
- Q. And, when you say the first time that business plan was presented to the Creditors' Committee was in mid-December?
- 23 A. Mid-December, that's correct.

19½ -- \$19.6 million.

4

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Q. Now, is that 5-year business plan -- is that the business plan and projections that serve to support the Northwestern's

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

proposed reorganization plan?

- 2 A. It is. I think there's been a few minor tweaks to it, but
- $_3$ the genesis of the plan is the plan that we developed for that
- 4 December of 2003.

1

- $_{5}\parallel$ Q. And from your perspective, any modifications from December
- $_{6}$ to today, for example, have been just small updates, technical
- 7 | amendments (inaudible)?
- 8 A. Yeah, updates -- there've been updates for cash. We've
- $9 \parallel \text{done}$ a little bit better on the cash generation than what was
- 10 | in the plan. But the fact of the matter is, as we look at that
- 11 \parallel plan for 2004, we're behind that plan. So while there's a
- 12 great deal of effort to say that that plan is a low-ball plan,
- 13 | the fact of the matter is, we're behind that plan from an
- 14 | EBITDA standpoint. Now, we're ahead of the plan from a cash
- 15 \parallel standpoint, but from an EBITDA standpoint, we're behind that
- 16 | plan.
- 17 | Q. Now, from your perspective, how would you compare, say if
- 18 | it's better or worse or no real change, how would you compare
- 19 the 5-year business plan supporting the Debtor's Reorganization
- 20 Plan to the projections that were that were developed in the
- 21 October/November 2003 timeframe?
- 22 $\|$ A. Well you know, the discipline in the plan, the ability for
- 23 us to measure and manage that on a monthly basis now is far
- 24 superior to anything that we had in the summer and fall of
- 25 \parallel 2003. And part of that is we brought in a new CFO, a CFO who

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

- has helped with the discipline on the plan and the reporting And we're -- you know, the company now can operate in 2 a much more stable business environment. 3
- Q. Now, you developed the projections in this 5-year business 4 plan, you presented to the Creditors' Committee in a mid-5
- December timeframe 2003. Prior to that, I think you testified there was no preconception about how any new equity and 7 restructure in Northwestern would be divided between the senior 8 unsecured notes and subordinated, correct?
- That's right. Our objective was to clearly manage or -- to 10 optimize the value of the estate and not figure out who was 11 gonna own what. 12
- But was your perspective that there was no value to equity? 13
 - That's correct. When we added up the value that we got,
- approximately it's about -- actually approximately it's the 15
- value that we have today, it was about a billion six, in total 16
- value of the company -- of the entity. 17
- So that December evaluation indicated a value of 18 approximately \$1.6 billion? 19
- That's correct. 20
- 21 And that has not really shifted very much since then,
- 22 correct?

14

- Some of the elements have shifted, we -- in early December, 23
- 24 we thought, in fact, that we had more value coming from the
- non-core assets and, in fact, we've had less value. 25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Austin - Direct

108

we were gonna have less cash flow coming from the main operations, in fact we had a little more value.

MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I'm gonna object to that last question -- the last question before that was --

THE COURT: You need to state your name counsel.

MR. MORRIS: I apologize. My name is John Morris, I'm from Kronish Lieb, I'm for the equity holders Kellogg Capital and RCG Carpathia. I've been very lenient, especially in the background. We're getting into substance and I would just request that Mr. Austin not lead the witness on these important figures.

MR. AUSTIN: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. AUSTIN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 15 Q. Mr. Austin, what is your perspective on whether management
- 16 | has included or not included all material factors in it's 5-
- 17 | year business plan of projections?
- 18 A. We've tried very diligently, as had the rest of the
- 19 | management team, to identify and consider all major factors in
- 20 | our business plan.
- 21 | Q. And you're familiar with that business plan, correct?
- 22 | A. I am.
- 23 | Q. One of the elements of that business plan is the -- I
- 24 | believe, that there's a need for approximately \$35 million in
- 25 cash at all times to be retained by reorganized Northwestern?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

A. What we've projected in -- as you identify what your liquidity needs are, both from a rating agency and from a vendor standpoint, we chose that \$35 million number. And I think that it shows as of September of 2004 that \$35 million number. In fact, what happens during the winter season is that some of that liquidity will be used up because as you go into the heating season, we have to buy a lot more gas, we have to buy a lot more electricity. And our need for financing, if you will, working capital financing, increases during the -- I think peaks sometime in January. So the \$35 million may be the number at September 30th. That would decrease going into the winter season.

- Q. If the cash was used, is that correct?
- A. If the cash was used or the debt -- we also plan of having a hundred million dollar exit revolving credit facility.
- Q. Well, if the company is able to attain a working capital credit line, can you explain why there's a need to also retain \$35 million in cash from the voucher?
 - A. Well, you really want a combination of the two. Do you need \$35 million everyday? Absolutely not. That's a good place holder so that you operate. As I said, in some cases you'll have \$35 million, as you go into the winter season, it might drop down to 5 or \$10 million. As long as you have that backstop or that working -- the revolver, you're fine. But the rating agencies and your vendors are looking for some liquidity

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Austin - Direct

measure in the form of cash on the balance sheet, I believe.

- Q. Let's focus on two other general areas of inquiry before we finally conclude your examination. First is an area referred
- 4 to, I think you've (indiscern.) QF.
- 5 A. Right.

2

3

- 6 | Q. Can you explain what a QF?
- $_7$ | A. A QF stands for Qualifying Facilities. It's a third party
- 8 energy producer and generally an alternate -- alternative
- g | energy wind, Wing Cogen, hydro, that we enter into contracts
- 10 with these third party power generated. It's under FERC
- 11 | regulations. It's under -- I should say federal regulation,
- 12 | but we enter into these facilities as part of our default power
- 13 | supply from Montana. I think there's approximately 19 of them
- $_{14} \parallel \text{that we have.}$
- 15 | Q. Is there any liability recorded on the company's balance
- 16 | sheet related to these QFs?
- 17 A. We record the liability and the reason for that liability
- 18 | is that the amount of contractual obligations we have for these
- 19 | qualifying facilities is greater than the amount that we can
- 20 | recapture as we pass through to our customers. And the amount
- 21 | that we have listed as a balance sheet item is 140 --
- 22 | approximately \$140 million.
- 23 | Q. And that's calculated how?
- 24 | A. It's a fairly -- I was about to say simple calculation.
- 25 | It's calculation that looks at the amount that we pay out over

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Certified Court Transcribers
732-320-0101

110

the next, in some cases, 26, 27 years, and the amount that we 1 are allowed to pass through in the form of charges to our 2 customers. The difference is a cash flow stream, again, over 3 this about 26, 28 year period. We take that negative cash flow 4 stream and discount it back to present value and use that 5 discounted value and that comes up with \$141 million. 6 Can you describe what actions, if any, were taken to try 7 and reduce that liability? We did analyze the QFs. We looked at as to whether or not 9 we could, in fact, reject them as executory contracts. 10 tried to run a calculation as to if they were rejected, what 11 would be the claim. If they were rejected, what would be the 12 resultant response from Montana and specifically consumer power 13 -- I'm sorry, the Consumer Counsel in Montana, because to that 14 extent that we achieved some benefit by the rejection or the 15 renegotiation, if you will, of those qualifying facilities, 16 some of those benefits might be claimed by the Consumer Counsel 17 18 and from the Montana PFC at that point. So, we looked at them, we determined that it was really not in the best interest of 19 the estate to reject them because the claims would be greater 20 than the benefit that we would accrue to the company. 21 Just on a rough basis, could you -- do you recall what may 22 23 have been the general claim that may have resulted if the company could have rejected the QF contracts? 24

Writer's Cramp, Inc.
Certified Court Transcribers
782-320-0101

Well, the total amount of contractual obligation that we

25

- had in the QFs was almost \$2 billion. And in taking -- you could have had claims at or -- and that was our calculation, 2 depending on what the QF parties -- the third parties came up 3 They may have come up with claims higher than that in fact. 5
- Is that gross or is that a present value note? Q. 6
- That's a gross number. Α. 7
- Now, one more question of QFs.
- Actually, to correct the record, I think it's actually higher than that. And for the life of me, I can't remember the 10 exact number. I think the gross number is actually higher than 11
- 1.9 million, but --12
- These QF contracts, as you explained it, are actual 13 contractual agreements for the company to purchase power, is 14 that correct? 15
- That's correct. 16

25

- Now, based on your experience, Mr. Austin, if a third party 17 came in to acquire Northwestern, what impact, if any, would 18 this \$140 million liability have on the purchase price?
- A. Well, if I were looking -- and I did some of this analysis 20
- back when I was in the leveraged buyout business -- but if I 21
- 22 looked at an obligation like this, it's a true cash obligation
- and I would subtract it from the valuation that I would be 23
- willing to pay for any company. 24
 - Now another asset which the company is identifying in its

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Reorganization Plan is net operating losses. Are you familiar 1 with those on a general basis? 2 A. On a general basis, absolutely. 3 Q. All right. Do you have an understanding of whether there's 4 any change in the value of the NOL with the company that 5 utilized from say, early December to sometime later? 6 A. When we originally looked at the NOL situation, which would 7 have been in the summer of 2003, at that time our calculation came up with -- and our calculation was done basically with 9 Deloitte & Touche and the help of their tax experts. We 10 calculated some \$735 million of NOL's. That subsequently has 11 been reduced, primarily because of a re-look at the NOL 12 calculation by Deloitte & Touche later in that year. Actually 13 it would have been early in 2004 when the recalculation was 14 done. 15 So that's just for a final re-analysis? 16 A. Yeah, these are -- I wouldn't say they're arcane, but 17 they're intricate calculations, and depending on what --18 depending upon the operating history of the company and how 19 Deloitte & Touche looks at those numbers, they can change from 20 time to time. 21 Q. Mr. Austin, you identified, I think, a number of goals that 22 this company had, Northwestern had at the beginning of this 23 Chapter 11 case. Sitting here today, what is your perspective 24

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Certified Court Transcribers

that if this Debtor's Plan is confirmed of what's been

25

732-329 0191

Austin - Direct

accomplished by this Debtor? Have those goals been accomplished from this case?

- A. I think a great deal has been accomplished. You know, the company is now operating in a very stable situation. It's improved its relationships with the regulators, it's built liquidity, it's sold primarily the non-core assets, although we still have a little bit to go. It should come out as a near investment grade -- and I say near, because I don't think we'll achieve the investment grade status on the first -- upon emergence. But I think a lot has been accomplished and I think the company is now a stable company that should emerge as a quality operating company.
- Q. Based on your understanding of the company, your
 familiarity with the company and this proposed Reorganization
 Plan, do you have a perspective on whether the recoveries under
 the Reorganization Plan would be better than if Northwestern
 were to be liquidated?
 - A. Well, we have, during this timeframe, entertained a number of offers from strategic buyers that have offered to buy the company -- or, I shouldn't say offered, they've shown some indications of interest. We were never able to get a firm offer, I would add, but those indications of interest were all at or below the value that we think was gonna come out of the emerged company here. So, I think as an emerged company, this the best thing for the Debtor to do.

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

3

5

6

7

Austin - Direct

115

Q. Mr. Austin, if this Plan is confirmed, do you have a perspective as to whether Northwestern will be able meet the obligations it providing for under the Reorganization Plan and not have to go through further restructuring?

- A. I believe it's a stable Plan, the company -- it's a stable operation and can meet its debt obligations and note obligations as they come due.
- 8 Q. Do you have a perspective today whether there is any g distributal value to Northwestern's equity holders?
- 10 A. I do not believe there is any distributal value, based on
 11 the waterfall analysis and based on the value that we've worked
 12 at in conjunction with our advisors.
- Q. If there's any significant additional delay in Northwestern obtaining confirmation of this Plan and exiting Chapter 11, do you have a perspective whether there would be any impact on the value that is proposed to be distributed to Northwestern Creditors?
- Well, one of issues and one of the reasons for speed in 18 19 this case is that the company -- well, it's got a stable EBITDA 20 and a stable financial projection. It does trade as an 21 interest sensitive stock, or it should, I believe, should trade as an interest sensitive stock. And if you look at interest 22 23 rates today versus what they'll be in 3 months -- and while I'm not a soothsayer on that -- I think the pressure for interest 24 25 rate increases is higher than interest rate decreases.

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

1	sooner we get out, do our exit financing, I think the more
2	value the company will have. That's just from the investment
3	banking side. From the standpoint of staying in bankruptcy and
4	incurring the kinds of costs that we're incurring today, I
5	think is a detriment to the estate. So, the sooner we get out,
6	I think, the better it is.
7	Q. I assume present company excepting that?
8	A. No, I wouldn't even except that.
9	MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, that's all the questions I
10	have for Mr. Austin.
11	THE COURT: All right, is there anybody who has
12	questions of Mr. Austin who is a proponent of the Plan?
13	ALL: (No verbal response).
14	THE COURT: If not, is there any cross examination
15	from any objector?
16	MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor. Just a few questions.
17	Again, John Morris for the equity holders.
18	CROSS EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. MORRIS:
20	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Austin.
21	A. Good afternoon, John.
22	Q. I think you said that at the time the company went into
23	Chapter 11 it did not have a good relationship with state
24	regulators, is that correct?
25	A. I would say that is correct.

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Austin - Cross

117

 $_1 \parallel Q$. And in fact, it was a poor relationship, is that correct?

- 2 A. I would characterize it as poor.
- $_3 \parallel Q$. And that was in part because of the decision by
- 4 Northwestern to extend the payment of taxes back in June as you
- 5 described, is that right?
- 6 A. Well, I think that's a little bit -- I think it ran a lot
- 7 deeper than just a non-payment of real estate taxes.
- 8 Q. I'm just asking, is that one particular reason?
- 9 A. I think that's one.
- $_{10}$ Q. And another particular reason was a consequence of
- 11 | Northwestern's decision to attempt to diversify, is that right?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. And go into all of these other businesses outside of their
- 14 core energy business, is that right?
- 15 A. It's clear that the diversification strategy was poorly
- 16 contemplated and poorly executed.
- 17 \parallel Q. And it was poorly received by the regulators, isn't that
- 18 | right?
- 19 $\|$ A. And it was poorly received by the regulators.
- 20 | Q. And it was poorly executed as well, isn't that right?
- 21 A. That is correct.
- 22 | Q. These were losing propositions?
- 23 | A. Yes, Sir.
- 24 | Q. And the regulators didn't want the rate payers,
- 25 | Northwestern's company -- customers to pay for the strategic

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

mistakes made by Northwestern, is that correct?

- A. I think that is an accurate assessment of their position.
- 3 Q. And to address those concerns that we've just talked about,
- 4 | Northwestern has, in fact, either sold or will shortly sell off
- it's non-core businesses, is that right?
- 6 A. That's right. It will revert back to it's core utility
- 7 | business, that's correct.

1

2

- 8 Q. And was there a settlement recently reached with the
- Montana Public Service Commission?
- 10 A. There has been, yes.
- 11 Q. Can you describe that for the Court?
- 12 A. Well, I -- in general, it's a settlement as to how the
- 13 | company will operate on a going-forward basis. It does
- 14 | ascribe, or prescribe, us to stay as a core gas and electric
- 15 | utility business. And it has certain restrictions and certain
- 16 reporting requirements and the like. But basically what it
- 17 says is we're gonna operate in the -- in a stable, straight-
- 18 forward manner in the utility business.
- 19 Q. And that's something that I take it was a positive
- 20 development vis-a-vis Northwestern's relationship with the
- 21 | regulators?
- 22 A. I believe it has been, yes.
- 23 | Q. Okay. If one of the goals with -- of Northwestern in
- 24 | entering Chapter 11 was rebuilding its relationship with the
- 25 state regulators, and we've identified the settlement and the

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

1	sale of the non-core businesses, what other steps has
2	Northwestern taken during the pendency of the bankruptcy case
3	to improve its relationship with the state regulators?
4	A. Well, I think one thing is the frequency of contact and the
5	openness of the communication. And I think we've tried to do
6	that and I think and I hope it's been appreciated by the
7	regulators. I mean, we owe it to the regulators to be forth
8	right and up front an open in terms of our finances and our
9	communications. And I think we've gone a long way to doing
10	that. Whether or not they all believe that yet, I don't know.
11	Q. But it is your understanding heading into bankruptcy that
12	one of the concerns the regulators had about Northwestern was
13	its lack of openness, is that right?
14	A. That's my understanding.
15	Q. And to the best of your knowledge, Northwestern has done
16	all it could to address that particular concern, is that right?
17	A. We are trying, yes, Sir.
18	Q. Are there any other ways in which Northwestern has
19	attempted to improve its relationship with state regulators?
20	A. I can't think of any others.
21	Q. But it is your belief that today Northwestern has a much
22	better relationship with the regulators than it did prior to
23	the time it entered bankruptcy, correct?
24	A. I believe it to be so, yes.

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

25

Certified Court Transcribers 732-329-0191

You talked a bit about the projections, do you recall that?

- $_{1} \parallel A$. I do.
- $_{2}\parallel$ Q. And over time, beginning last summer through the end of the
- 3 | year, the projections got better and better with each cut of
- $_4$ | the plan, is that right?
- $_{5}$ A. I believe they got more disciplined and more accurate,
- 6 | that's correct.
- $_7$ \parallel Q. And one of the things that was a result of that process was
- 8 | the inclusion of these pension expenses that you talked about,
- g | is that right?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 | Q. And the projections now include approximately \$20 million
- 12 per year in pension expense throughout the projection period,
- 13 | is that right?
- 14 | A. That's correct.
- 15 \parallel Q. And is that today the company's best estimate of what the
- 16 | pension expense will be over that time?
- 17 A. To the best of my knowledge, that's the -- there'll be some
- 18 | tweaks from time to time and we'll look at it every year, but
- 19 | that's our best guess at this point.
- 20 | Q. Okay. But it is the company's position that the
- 21 | projections today fully reflect the pension expense that's
- 22 expected over time?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And in fact, in creating the projections Northwestern tried
- $25 \parallel \text{diligently to consider all of the major factors in creating the}$

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Austin - Cross

121

projections, is that right?

- A. I believe we did.
- 3 | Q. Just a couple of more questions, Mr. Austin, and thank you
- 4 | for your patience. You talked for a few minutes about the net
- 5 | operating losses, do you remember that?
- $_{6}$ A. Yes.

2

- $_7 \parallel Q$. And you said that in the summer of 2003, Deloitte's best
- 8 | estimate at that time was that they were available \$735 million
- 9 of net operating losses, is that right?
- $_{10}$ | A. Right, that's my recollection and that would have been as
- 11 of the date of emerge -- what we always do is we look at the
- 12 | net operating losses as the date that we plan to emerge. So if
- 13 | we look at it at 735, we looked at it such that it -- that's
- 14 what we would calculate it would be at the date of emergence.
- 15 Q. And when you talk about the date of emergence, you're
- 16 | talking about the period of time immediately after the Plan is
- 17 | confirmed and the company is no longer in bankruptcy, is that
- 18 | right?
- 19 | A. That's right, and we always estimated that at about
- 20 | September 30th of this year.
- 21 | Q. And so that would also be the time in which the conversion
- 22 | of debt to equity has already been accomplished?
- 23 | A. Right.
- 24 | Q. What is your understanding of the current best estimate of
- 25 | the value of the NOLs?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Certified Court Transcribers

Austin - Cross

122

A. It's somewhat less than that, I don't know the exact number, but it's less than that.

- Q. Is it fair to say it's north of 600 million?
- A. I think it is north of \$600 million.
 - Q. No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, anybody else have any questions?

MR. HOUSTON: Yes, Your Honor, this is Joseph Houston

here for Mr. Hylland.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Houston.

MR. HOUSTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. HOUSTON:

- Q. Sir, I'm assuming that you are familiar with the name Richard Hylland?
- 15 A. I am.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

- 16 | Q. And I'm assuming that you are familiar that he has filed an
- 17 | objection -- a limited objection to the proposed Plan of
- 18 | Reorganization, correct?
- 19 A. That's my understanding.
- 20 | Q. And do you know what the nature of his objection is?
- 21 A. Frankly, I do not.
- 22 | Q. Well, I'll tell you that one of them is that the way in
- 23 | which to -- the proposed distribution (inaudible) relating to
- 24 | the D&O Trust is set up is unfair and discriminatory. Are you
- 25 | aware of that?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

As I said, I'm not aware of how (inaudible). (Telephone connection interference) 2 Can you hear me? 3 I said I'm not aware of how his objection was 4 characterized. 5 Well, Mr. Hylland has objected on the basis, in part, that 6 the manner in which the D&O Trust is set up is FIFO. Are you 7 familiar with the term FIFO? 8 MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, I'd like to raise an 9 objection that this cross examination is beyond the scope and 10 it also -- of the Direct examination, and also that he's really 11 arguing confirmation issues. 12 THE COURT: Well, it strikes me more as argument. 13 witness has already indicated that he is not familiar with the 14 Hylland objection. 15 Α. Right. 16 THE COURT: So I think there may be a lack of 17 Where are you going with this, Counsel? foundation here. 18 MR. HOUSTON: Well Your Honor, I want to see if this 19 witness understands what the term FIFO is and whether this 20 witness is -- adopts the {quote} "Debtor's response" to Mr. 21 Hylland's objection with respect to this trust. And I think 22 that -- and I also have a couple of factual questions that I 23 need to establish from him. 24

THE COURT:

25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.
Certified Court Transcribers

732-329-0191

I think you ought to go to the factual

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

issues because I think the others are argument, and those can be raised, those are preserved. But the witness has already testified that he doesn't -- he's not familiar with the Hylland objection. So why don't you move onto the factual issues as to which this witness may have some information. MR. HOUSTON: Very good, Sir. BY MR. HOUSTON: Q. Sir, do you understand the term FIFO, F-as in Fred, I-F-as in Fred, O? THE COURT: No. MR. AUSTIN: Objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. That's not what I want you to talk about. I don't think that's within the scope of what this witness has indicated he had foundation to talk about. think you ought to -- if you have factual questions, please ask them. MR. HOUSTON: Very good. BY MR. HOUSTON: Q. Sir, is it your understanding of the operation of the D&O

Q. Sir, is it your understanding of the operation of the D&O Trust that if there are let's say, for example, 28 claimants to the Trust, and that happens to be the number of class 12 ballots that were reflected in the voting. If there are 28 claimants to the Trust and let's say claimants numbers one through 25 submit claims and exhaust the trust, that claims numbers 26 through 28 get zero?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

1	MR. AUSTIN: Objection, again, Your Honor, same basis
2	as before. He's just going at it at a different angle.
3	A. I don't pretend to be qualified to talk about the
4	channeling trust and
5	THE COURT: Sustained.
6	MR. HOUSTON: Very good, Sir. Nothing further.
7	THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else have
8	anything
9	MR. MORRIS: In fact, nothing at all, I guess,
10	actually.
11	(Laughter)
12	MR. HOUSTON: Very good, Sir. Nothing further.
13	THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anybody else
14	MR. HOUSTON: In fact, nothing at all, I guess
15	actually.
16	(Laughter)
17	MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, I have one comment to make
18	and I have then I'd like to ask one question on redirect.
19	And I will get my question out of the way and then I'll do my
20	comment.
21	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. AUSTIN:
23	Q. Mr. Austin, as relates to the sale of the non-core
24	business, which you had previously testified to, do you have a
25	perspective as to whether the Debtor will actually have access

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Austin - Redirect

to the cash from the disposition of those non-core assets such as the Cornerstone note, Expanets and Blue Dot and MFN by, for example, October 30th?

MR. RATNER: Objection, this is beyond the scope of my cross.

MR. AUSTIN: You asked a question about timing on the non-core assets.

MR. RATNER: I don't believe I did at all, Your Honor.

All I did was ask whether or not the sale of the non-core

assets satisfied one of the concerns of the regulators.

THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. AUSTIN:

Q. You can answer the question.

THE COURT: Can you answer the question?

A. I don't believe we'll have access -- we may have access to some small amount from Blue Dot, but we will not have access, I don't believe, from the sale of the other (inaudible).

MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, that's all the questions I have.

THE COURT: Let me see, does anybody else have any questions? I thought I saw Mr. Snellings --

MR. AUSTIN: Well, my comment, that's one of the things -- why Mr. Snellings is rising is pursuant to the agreements that were stated at the telephonic hearing last Friday and today is Mr. Snellings, on behalf of his client, Law

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Austin - Redirect

Debenture and I believe Ms. Steingart on behalf of Mag Ten, the agreement is that they do not have to participate in the cross examination of the witnesses today. They reserve their right to cross examine the witnesses when we come back for the hearing on October the 6th. And I think they will undertake to let us know whether indeed we need to bring back any or all of these witnesses for that purpose prior to the next hearing.

MR. SNELLINGS: That's right. I just want to make sure that was on the record, and we don't want to put it on the record for every witness, but --

THE COURT: All right, that's the understanding I have from the hearing we had telephonically last Friday.

MR. SNELLINGS: Thank you.

THE COURT: That's acceptable.

MR. AUSTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, is there anybody else? If not then thank you, Mr. Austin, you may step down. Would this be a good time to take a short break for lunch and then we'll start up again? Who do we have coming next.

MR. AUSTIN: We have -- Mr. Hanson will be our next witness, Your Honor, followed by Mr. Byrd and (inaudible).

THE COURT: All right, well, we will start again in 1 hour. So let's get back in time to do that.

ALL: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Recess)

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Certified Court Transcribers

Hanson - Direct

128

THE COURT: Please be seated. All right, are we ready to proceed?

MS. DENNISTON: We are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Denniston?

MS. DENNISTON: Thank you, Your Honor. We would call Mike Hanson to the stand at this time.

THE COURT: All right Mr. Hanson, come forward to the Courtroom Deputy to be sworn.

MIKE HANSON, DEBTOR'S WITNESS, SWORN

THE COURT: All right, please speak up clearly, Mr. Hanson, into the microphone.

MR. HANSON: Yes, Your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 BY MS. DENNISTON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

- Q. Mr. Hanson, can you state your name for the record please?
- 16 A. My name is Mike Hanson. Last name is spelled H-A-N-S-O-N.
- 17 | W. And what is your position at Northwestern?
- 18 A. I'm the Chief Operating Officer,
- 19 Q. Can you give us a brief description of what your duties and
- 20 responsibilities are as the Chief Operating Officer?
- 21 A. As Chief Operating Officer, I'm responsible for the day-to-
- 22 day operations of the utility business that includes
- 23 | transmission operations, distribution operations, regulatory
- 24 affairs, government affairs, customer care, as we call it, or
- 25 | customer service, information technology and various support

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Certified Court Transcribers

functions.

2

4

- And how long have you been employed at Northwestern?
- A. A little over 6 years. I joined the company June 1st in 3 1998.
- Q. And can you tell us what capacities that you've been 5 employed in at Northwestern? 6
- A. Since joining the company I was originally -- my title was 7 President and Chief Executive Officer of the energy division of 8 Northwestern Corporation. And then last year, upon divestiture 9 of the non-utility and consolidation of the corporation to one 10
- entity, the utility, I became Chief Operating Officer in 11
- August. 12
- August of 2004? Q. 13
- 2000 --Α. 14
- 2003. Ο. 15
- 2003, yes. Α. 16
- And have you served in that capacity throughout this 17
- bankruptcy proceeding? 18
- 19 Yes I have.
- And do you expect to continue to serve in that capacity 20
- upon the Debtor's exit? 21
- Α. Yes I do. 22
- Can you tell me a little bit about Northwestern's 23
- management? I want to talk about the senior management. 24
- basically, can you tell me are you familiar with Northwestern's 25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

senior management?

- A. Certainly.
- Q. And you are a part of that senior management team?
- ₄∥A. Yes Iam.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And do you expect the senior management team to continue to manage Northwestern upon exit?
- $_{7}$ | A. Yes we do.
- Q. Can you give the Court a bit of background on each of the individuals that constitute the senior management team?
 - A. Our President and Chief Executive Officer, Gary Drook, has been a Director of the company since 1998. He came on as the President and CEO of Northwestern Corporation January 6th of 2003. Gary has over 26 years with regulated utility experience in the telephone industry. He spent a -- that part of his career with the Bell system and eventually what was Ameritech. He retired, I believe it was 1995, from Ameritech and took over an in-bound telemarketing business called Aphena, at which time then he joined the Board and, as I said, came on as President and CEO.

I've been in the utility business for almost 24 years; started in the business in the gas construction department of Northern State's Power Company in LaCrosse, Wisconsin back in 1981. Went from there to the office doing budgeting and variance analysis while I was completing a degree at UW-Lacrosse. Upon getting my accounting degree from UW-Lacrosse,

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

I moved to Minneapolis and was in their accounting department and then later became the internal auditor for about 5 years. While I was an internal auditor, I went to law school at William Mitchell College of Law, graduated in May of 1989 and became a regulatory attorney for NSP. Did that for about 5 years until January of '94 they appointed me to be the Chief Executive of their South Dakota operations. In 1997 their North and South Dakota operations were combined under me. And then I was recruited by previous management of Northwestern to come in as President and CEO of what was then called Northwestern Public Service in January -- or June, excuse me, of 1998.

Brian Byrd is our Chief Financial Officer. He joined our company in December of 2003. He has 18 years of financial management experience with a variety of different companies, from airlines to the Minnesota Vikings, but 7 years of that is in the energy business. He was with NRG, a subsidiary of Excel Energy, and most recently Insight Energy. He joined the company in December.

And Roger Schrum, who is our Vice President of Human Resources and Communications has about 20 years of regulated utility experience with Northwestern and Scana in South Carolina.

Q. And this would be Northwestern's proposed senior management upon exit?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

A. That's correct.

Q. And was this senior management team involved in the Chapter

11 bankruptcy proceeding?

A. Yes.

2

3

11

12

15

24

25

Q. With regard to the people that you supervise as the Chief

6 | Operating Officer, can you give us a brief overview of your

7 | direct reports?

8 A. Yes. Very briefly, starting in the lower left corner, Pat

 $_{
m g}$ | Corcoran is the Vice President of Regulatory Affairs for our

10 | entire enterprise, all three states. He has 26 years, all of

it in the regulatory department in Montana. Dave Gates is Vice

President of Transmission Operations. He also has 26 years of

13 utility experience with Montana Power Company and ourselves.

14 Dave has managed energy supply distribution operations and now

transmission operations. Dennis Lopatch, who's called Vice

16 | President of Administration, is in charge of government

17 | affairs, our lobbying effort, and legal responsibilities in

18 | Montana. He was once an attorney for the Montana Public

19 | Service Commission and then went and spent the majority of his

20 career with Mountain Bell, later U.S. West, and joined us in

21 | 2001. Kurt Pole is Vice President of Distribution Operations,

22 | Again, for all three states. He resides in Montana. He has 18

23 | years of experience, all of it with Northwestern. Bobby

Shrapel is Vice President of Customer Care. She has 11 years

of utility experience with Minkota Electric Co-Op in Minnesota

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

24

25

1	and now Northwestern. Bart Thielbar, Vice President of
2	Information Technology has about 18 years of IT experience, 6
3	of that with Northwestern. And Greg Trandon, who's Vice
4	President of Support Services, which is Fleet facilities,
5	supply chain, things of that nature, has 28 years of utility
6	experience with Excel Energy and Northwestern.
7	Q. Okay if we look at this, what's been marked as Debtor's
8	Exhibit-128, can you tell us which individuals have been
9	directly involved in working with Northwestern throughout this
10	bankruptcy proceeding? I think there's a few others.
11	(Debtor's Exhibit-128 previously marked for
12	identification)
13	A. Okay, in terms of the senior management, Gary Drook has
14	been there throughout. I mentioned Brian Byrd joining us in
1 5	December. I've been there throughout the process, as has Roger
16	Schrum, Eric Jacobson, our general counsel. And Bill Austin,
17	our Chief Restructuring Officer, joined us in April of that
18	year. All of these people have been in their current
19	capacities since before the bankruptcy proceeding began.
20	Q. Okay, and just to sum up with regard to your role as to any
21	of the other senior management, who is the person that's
22	primarily responsible for the maintaining the relationship
23	with the regulatory entity?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Let's talk a little bit about Northwestern's operations.

That would be myself and Pat Corcoran.

Can you give us a quick summary of the -- Northwestern Energy's operations?

A. We deliver energy, gas and electric energy, to about 608,000 customers in three states: Montana, South Dakota and Nebraska. I have the customers broken down in the slide, but we have about 305,000 electric customers in Montana. We have about 7,000 miles of transmission lines in that state. We have 58,000 electric customers in South Dakota, and over 3,100 miles of electric transmission lines in that state. Natural gas, we deliver to 163,000 customers in Montana, with 3,500 miles of distribution lines, 2,000 miles of transmission pipeline, and 82,000 customers in South Dakota and Nebraska, split roughly equally; there's about 41,000 in each state, 2,100 miles. In each of those we are the transmission and distribution provider. We do not own any production in Montana. We have a small amount of electric production in South Dakota.

- 17 | Q. And how would you characterize Northwestern's business?
- 18 A. We are a transmission and distribution utility.
- 19 Q. And what percentage of Northwestern's business is 20 regulated?
- 21 A. We get over 90% -- I believe it's about 95% of our gross 22 margin comes from the regulated operations.
- 23 Q. Let's talk just a bit about the energy supply structure.
- 24 What can you tell us about Northwestern's energy supply
- 25 | structure?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

A. Well, I'll start first with electric supply because it's a little different in South Dakota than Montana, the two states we have electricity. In South Dakota we do only electric generators, and so we'll describe ourselves as being vertically integrated for electric supply. We don't own fuel sources, coal mines or gas wells, like some utilities. But we own some shares of base load plants of other PE plants, the transmission and distribution lines, and we supply through what are called bundle rates; it's a combined rate for generation and the delivery transmission distribution.

In Montana, we are the electric default supplier, as it's called, which means that we procure electricity and deliver it to customers that have not chosen to procure electricity from another source. They may choose to do that, they don't have to. Some states call that the provider of last resort, but we don't own any electric production and we make no margin on that service. We sell the electricity exactly at cost. We do own the transmission and distribution lines and make our margins on the delivery.

In natural gas we are the local distribution company in all three states. In Montana, we also serve the role of default supplier, again, for people who have not chosen to buy the commodity from someone else. And in South Dakota/Nebraska, we procure commodity on behalf of customers, deliver it through our pipes to their homes and businesses, and we do earn a small

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

margin on that in those two states.

- Q. And how does being a default supply impact Northwestern's business plan?
- A. Well, it impacts it because we procure -- depending on what commodity prices do over the year, if it's something north of \$400 million a year of natural gas and electricity that we make no margin and it puts risk on us over whether we're going to recover those costs or not.
- Q. Okay, and what portion of those costs is not recovered?
- A. We've -- what portion is not recovered? The on the electric side we have not had any disallowances of costs. We do not recover all of our administrative expenses at this time. The cost, for example, of the people doing the procurement activity are not included in the commodity charge; it's a glitch we hope to fix in future rates. In natural gas we have had a recent disallowance of about \$6 million a year for a 2 year period, or 12 million, on natural gas. So it's not been large but still \$12 million is a significant amount to us.
- Q. And how did that become disallowed? Can you give us just a bit of background there?
- A. Certainly. The Commission, in reviewing our annual gas cost (indiscern.), looked at the way we procured natural gas, determined that we had not replaced what was a fixed price contract with another fixed price contract. That fixed price contract that expired was a buy-back agreement when Montana

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

	10.00
1	Power sold the gas production. And we couldn't replace it in
2	the market anyway, but they determined us to be imprudent in
3	failing to replace that at a fixed price and then imputed a
4	price against us and disallowed the difference.
5	Q. And what has been Northwestern's response, if any?
6	A. Well, our response was to ask for reconsideration, which
7	failed. And we have now appealed that decision to the District
8	Court in the state of Montana.
9	Q. Would it be fair to characterize that as an ongoing
10	dispute?
11	A. It is still continuing, yes.
12	Q. Let's talk briefly about Northwestern's service profile.
13	What can you tell us and let's start with Montana what
14	can you tell us about Northwestern's service profile in
15	Montana?
16	A. Well, this map depicts the service area we have in Montana;
17	it's about 107,000 square miles. It's the western ¾ of the
18	state. The population in that area as of the 2000 census was
19	about 786,000 people, (indiscern.) 305,000 electric customers
20	and 160,000 gas customers.
21	THE COURT: Can we excuse me. Can we just take a
22	very short break here? I have another matter I have to take up
23	that'll be very short, I'm so informed.

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Thank you, Your Honor.

Sorry. Don't leave, Mr. Hanson.

MS. DENNISTON:

THE COURT:

24

25

Hanson - Direct

MR. HANSON: Yes Sir.

2

1

(Recess)

з ||

THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Denniston.

4

MS. DENNISTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

5

BY MS. DENNISTON:

6 |

Q. With regard to Montana, can you just -- just to back up and be sure that we're clear. The total population in Montana

7 8

was what?

9

A. The total population of Montana as of the 2000 census was

10

about 902,000. The areas that we serve at a population of

11

about 786,000. And if you think back to the many miles of line

12

that I talked about, we have a widely dispersed area, a very

South Dakota, we serve roughly the eastern third.

13

low customer and low density in Montana. Similarly in eastern

14

15

population of the state of South Dakota was 754,000. We serve

97% thousand as of the 2000 census. It's a little hard to see

on this map, but it'll appear. The reason is we do not serve

again, many miles of line, low customer density, both states,

both gas and electricity in those two areas. And then we serve

an area that covers less than 100,000 people; it's about

Sioux Falls, which is right here, the largest city in the

state, or the second largest city, Rapid City, out here.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

four communities in central Nebraska: Grand Island, Kearney,
North Platt and Aldo, with a combined population of less than

100,000, it's about 75,000 people. Just natural gas

25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Certified Court Transcribers
132-329-0191

138

distribution in Nebraska.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Turning to specifics of electric transmission. What can you tell us about the service territory and electric transmission for Northwestern?

Well, as this slide points out, 125,000 square miles service area is very large. The two pieces of Montana and South Dakota are in two different reliability counsels. A liability counsel -- Western Electricity Coordinating Counsel in Mid-Common Area Power Pool are power pools where the generation and transmission is all interconnected to maintain stability and reliability of the system. And so they are coordinating operations between all utilities in that region. The two happen to fall into two different reliability counsels. Despite that fact, our System Operation and Control Center in Butte is -- does the system operation and dispatch for our gas and electric operations in all three states. I mentioned earlier that we are not vertically integrated in Montana. We do not have any generation in Montana, we just have transmission and distribution. We do have a small amount of generation in South Dakota. Our System Control Center in Montana also functions as what's called a control area operator. And what a control area operator does is the one who actually dispatches the power plants to match the generation to the load at every moment of every day. So notwithstanding that

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

we don't own it, we are directing the owners of the plant of

1	what load to carry and what power plants to run. We have
2	almost 7,000 circuit miles in Montana and 1,300 in South
3	Dakota.
4	Q. Let's talk just a bit about the gas transmission and
5	storage. What can you tell us about Northwestern's gas
6	transmission and storage?
7	A. Well, we have a very extensive transmission gas
8	transmission system in Montana, with about 2,000 miles of gas
9	transmission pipe. There are six interconnections, four of
10	them that are significant: TransCanada Pipeline coming out of
11	Alberta to the north, Colorado Interstate Gas coming up from
12	Wyoming to the south, the Williston Base and Interstate
13	Pipeline well, pick up the pace, I take it.
14	(Laughter)
15	Q. Sorry about that, Mike.
16	THE COURT: Ah, technology.
17	MS. DENNISTON: I hear Mr. Austin sitting over there
18	thinking, "I told you so."
19	(Court and counsel confer)
20	MS. DENNISTON: There you go, Mike.
21	A. I was describing the significant pipeline interconnections.
22	Williston Basin Pipeline to the northeast, and Cana Gathering
23	System also in Canada. Energy West and Haver Pipeline are
24	small interconnections within the state of Montana. We also
25	happen to have about 17 BCF of storage. To put that into

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

perspective, the annual gas load for our customers in Montana 1 is about 22 BCF. So you can store not quite a year's worth of 2 What this allows us to do is deliver from the Rockies 3 Production Zone or the Canadian Production Zone into the state. 4 In just rough terms to put it into perspective, the gas 5 transmission and distribution constitutes about 25% of our 6 gross margin. Electric distribution and transmission is about 7 75%. 8 Let's talk a bit about the South Dakota generation. mentioned briefly that there was some generation in South 10 Dakota. What can you tell us about that? 11 A. We own -- we are a minority interest holder of three base 12 load coal generating units: One of them Cayota Station up in 13 North Dakota, the Big Stone Plant in eastern South Dakota, and 14 a portion of Neo Unit in Iowa. Cayota and Big Stone are 15 operated by Outerdale Power Company, the Neo Unit by Mid-16 American. So we're a non-operating minority holder. 17 operate the plants. In total, 208 megawatts of base load 18 generation. We also have about 119 megawatts of small gas and 19 oil fired peaking units that are throughout our territory, so 20 we own a total of, you know, just under 327 megawatts, but 21 we're not an operator of power plants, per se. The electric 22 generation that we own constitutes less than 5% of our revenue 23 and margin on the company as a whole. 24 And do you have an understanding of how this ownership

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

25

impacts Northwestern's valuation?

- I'm not an expert on valuation, but since it's such a small 2 part, less than 5%, I wouldn't think it'd have any material 3 effect on the valuation.
- MS. DENNISTON: And for the record, Your Honor, we're 5 skipping slide #40 as we've already covered the electric system 6 and distribution system, just so that the record's clear. 7
- BY MS. DENNISTON: 8

4

- Mr. Hanson, are you familiar with the other utility 9 companies in the industry that have both gas and electric 10 distribution? 11
- Most of them. 12
- And do you have an understanding as to whether or not they 13
- have a similar ratio of -- if I were to ask you, similar ratio 14
- of gas to electric? 15
- For many of them --16
- 17 Q. For example --
- -- some do, some don't. 18 Α.
- 19 Ο, -- Vectron.
- Α. Yes. 20
- How is Vectron compared to Northwestern? Ο. 21
- Vectron is almost the opposite. They're in Indiana and 22
- Ohio and they get about 70% of their revenue from gas and 30% 23
- from electric. We're almost the inverse. We get about 75 from 24
- electric and 25 from gas. 25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

Hanson - Direct

143

Q. Okay. And I believe you testified earlier that
Northwestern was how much -- what percentage regulated?

- 3 | A. It's about 95%.
- $_4 \parallel Q$. And do you haven an understanding as to the other -- some
- $_{5}\parallel$ of the other utility companies in the industry as to their
- 6 percentage of regulation versus non-regulated activity?
- 7 A. I have reviewed many of them and I do, yes.
- Q. And what do you -- if I were to ask you what would be the
- g | difference on Allegheny Energy?
- 10 A. Well, Allegheny as an example, in 2003 got about 40% of
- 11 | it's revenues from non-regulated operations.
- 12 | Q. And how about Synergy Corporation?
- 13 A. Synergy about -- not quite 40, 37% I believe.
- 14 Q. And how about PNM Resources?
- 15 A. PNM also had about 37% from non-regulated activities.
- 16 Q. And in your roll as the Chief Operating Officer, do you
- 17 keep up to date with the various industry periodicals and trade
- 18 | magazines?
- 19 A. Certainly.
- 20 | Q. And do you review those on a regular basis?
- 21 A. Yes I do.
- 22 | Q. With regard to -- I want to switch now -- switch gears and
- 23 | talk a little bit more about the specifics of the regulation
- 24 that Northwestern has to contend with. What can you tell us
- 25 about the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission?

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

- Well, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regulates 1 energy transactions in interstate commerce basically. And so 2 if sales of electricity -- what we would call wholesale sales 3 or sales to other utilities are deemed to be an interstate 4 commerce and regulated by the FERC, as is transmission --5 electric transmission or gas transmission sales to other 6 utilities.
- And who at Northwestern is the primary person that 8 interacts with FERC? 9
- Pat Corcoran. Α. 10
- And are you -- do you supervise Mr. Corcoran? 11
- I do, yes. Α.
- So would you consider yourself to be up to date on 13
- activities as between Northwestern and FERC? 14
- Α. Yes. 15

7

- And can you tell us how you would characterize the 16 relationship Northwestern has with FERC? 17
- The relationship and regulatory environment with FERC is 18 stable. We don't have any major issues or controversies 19 recently or pending with FERC. 20
- Northwestern is also subject to another layer of 21 22 regulation, is it not?
- Yes, state regulation. 23
- What can you tell us about the state regulation? 24
- 25 Well, each of the state public service or public utility

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

commissions regulate the rates and terms and conditions of service within their state. They have varying jurisdiction on other matters. For example, Montana has jurisdiction to oversee financing and the capital structure of the company whereas the others do not. But they all regulate the rates that we charge to retail customers and the terms, the tariff conditions, for those services.

- Okay, and with regard to Montana Public Service Commission, who is the primary person at Northwestern responsible for that relationship? 10
- That is Pat Corcoran and myself. 11
- 12 Okay, and would you say -- are you up to date on the status of the relationship as between Northwestern and the Commission? 13
- Yes. Α. 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- And how would you describe the relationship Northwestern 15 has with the Commission? 16
- 17 The environment in Montana has been very challenging I 18 would say. We've had a large number of issues, matters before the Commission. The Commission has had a long history before 19 Northwestern acquired Montana Power of a -- what I would say 20 21 more consumer-oriented results, meaning less favorable to the company. I might contrast that with South Dakota in 22 23 particular. We've had a long environment in South Dakota with 24 very little issues and controversy. The Nebraska Public 25 Service Commission is fairly new. It's been around just less

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

- than 2 years, but we've established a pretty good rapport with 1 that Commission and, again, have no major issues or 2 controversies pending in Nebraska.
- Q. And are you familiar with the stipulation and settlement 4 that the Debtor has entered into as between the Debtor, the 5 Public Service Commission from Montana and the Consumer's 6 Counsel? 7
- Yeş I am. Α. 8

3

- Were you involved in the negotiations leading up to that 9 stipulation? 10
- A. Yes I was. 11
- What can you tell us about how that stipulation has 12 impacted the relationship between Northwestern and the Montana 13 Public Service Commission? 14
- Well, the stipulation certainly resolves a number of issues 15 that were raised by the Commission and the Montana Consumer 16 Counsel in this bankruptcy proceeding. It does not resolve all 17 of the issues and controversies that we have pending before 18 that Commission. 19
- Q. And what did the Debtor accomplish by entering into that 20 stipulation? 21
- Well, the main accomplishment in resolving these issues was 22 23 to get the Commission and Consumer Counsel support, or at least they're no longer objecting to our Plan of Reorganization, and 24 they are and have authorized the financing activities necessary 25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

to effectuate that Plan.

1

2

3

4

- Q. And do you know if the Public Service Commission has entered a order approving stipulation?
- A. Yes, they just recently did that.
- Q. Let's talk about some of the issues or some of the points under the stipulation. What is the impact of the ring fencing component?
- Well, let me first describe what's meant by the term. 8 fencing is structurally separating ownership of utility assets 9 from non-utility assets. So under this stipulation, the parent 10 company of Northwestern will own only regulated utility assets. 11 Any non-utility or non-regulated assets we may own will be 12 relatively minor, but they will be held in subsidiary 13 Any debt that we take on at the parent company to companies. 14 15 finance the activities of the utility cannot be used to fund non-utility activities except for a limited investment basket, 16 which I'll describe in just a second. Any debt associated with 17 the non-utility subsidiaries must be non-recourse to the parent 18 and you can't have cross default provisions, things of that 19 This limited investment basket is -- starts out at \$60 20 21 million, and that was created in order to allow the company to provide basically working capital support for the small non-22 23 utility subs that it does have. If any assets are divested, whether they be utility assets of the parent or non-utility at 24 one of the subs, debt attached to that or associated with --25

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

1	must follow the asset. Another pretty significant provision, l
2	think, is that the Commission will not institute a rate review
3	any sooner than the fall of 2006. We are required by September
4	of that year to file rate information based on a 2005
5	(inaudible) as it's called with the Commission and the Consumer
6	Counsel. It is not clear whether there will be any party
7	seeking a change in rates. If there is a party, ourselves or
8	the Consumer Counsel for example, that party bears the burden
9	of proof. But with that, we know that rates will not be
10	changed any sooner than 2007, following the review period from
11	this filing.
12	Q. So in connection with the time period between now and that
13	filing the rates won't go up or down?
14	A. Our T&D rates will not go up or down. The commodity costs
15	are collected through a past supervision not covered by this
16	(inaudible). T&D rates we earn our margin or profit on will
17	not go up or down in that period.
18	Q. In connection with the stipulation, how would you
19	characterize whether Northwestern's receiving a greater or
20	lesser degree of regulation?
21	A. Well, I think in many respects a greater degree because
22	with this stipulation we have various filing requirements,
23	information; we've got to keep them informed. The Commission
24	apparently takes a view that gives them an active role in
25	anything from management of the company to ownership. There

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was a recent public statement covered in the press in Montana that the Commission believes that if the company were to be sold that it has the right to approve the sale and is proposing that it create criteria by which it will judge the fitness of any prospective buyer. Another issue not on the slide, but we were asked in conjunction with the stipulation to do a -- to hire a third party to assess the condition of our plant, our physical plant, the transmission and distribution systems, gas and electric. We retained a firm by the name of Liberty Consulting to do that. And now we need to file a follow-up report with the Commission, and they're going to monitor our progress in implementing any changes to our maintenance or construction activities. Have you had a chance to review the Liberty Consulting Group's report? Yes, certainly. In great detail. And have you made a determination as to what the impact is going to be on Northwestern from a cash flow perspective? A. We haven't come up with a final figure. Some of the activities that are recommended are covered within our current budget, they're just a change in approach. Others are going to require additional resources. But I would say that without question it's going to put some upward pressure on our costs, both from an operating expense standpoint and in capital expenditure standpoint. Some of those we may be able to offset

Writer's Cramp, Inc.

with other (inaudible). As of right now, we do not have an assessment of the total impact.

THE COURT: Excuse me for just a moment. We are getting a good deal of interference on the telephone lines, so it sounds as if there's either a bad connection or maybe somebody is shuffling something. I must advise you that if this continues, I'm going to require that the telephone connection be terminated and re-established. We're hearing it right now. So the next time that happens, we're going to terminate the telephone line --

(Telephone interference continues)

THE COURT: Let's do it. Let's terminate the telephone connection and set it up again. Everybody on the telephone, you are being terminated at this moment.

(Telephone connections terminated)

THE COURT: All right, I think we can go ahead and proceed. My view of the world is that anybody who is on the telephone takes the risk of technology, and so let's not waste everybody else's time here. We'll try to get that hooked up again. How as -- who was in charge of doing that, somebody at the Debtors -- who hooked up this?

MS. DENNISTON: I think -- Mr. Chipman, do you know anything about this?

(Laughter)

(Counsel confer)

Writer's Cramp, Inc.